



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,071	01/08/2002	Marc Michael Groz	MG022704USNP	4941
57572 7590 04/09/2008 MARK S. NOWOTARSKI 30 GLEN TERRACE STAMFORD, CT 06906				
EXAMINER				
HOEL, MATTHEW D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/09/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/043,071

**Applicant(s)**

GROZ, MARC MICHAEL

**Examiner**

Matthew D. Hoel

**Art Unit**

3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.(3) Mark Nowotarski, agent.(2) Ronald Laneau, primary examiner.(4) Marc Groz, applicant.

Date of Interview: 03 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all, independent Claim 42 in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: Silva, Nilssen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We agreed that the sale of the securities to investors was separate from the sale of the lottery/bond tickets to the players. This was discussed as a possible amendment to Claim 42. This corresponded to limitation 4 of Fig. 3B of the applicant's specification. This did not appear to be fairly suggested by Silva or Nilssen, which the examiner believes are the closest prior art. Further consultation is needed before final indication of allowability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ronald Laneau/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required